

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 3, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 34, 39 and 53 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 34-59 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 34-44 and 46-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,456,350, issued to Ashizawa et al. (hereafter "Ashizawa") in view of U.S. Patent no. 5,745,207, issued to Asada et al. (hereafter "Asada"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Ashizawa nor Asada, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Ashizawa and Asada fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device that includes "each of the plurality of common electrodes has a substantially sawtooth-shaped base in a region where each common electrode connects to the common line", as recited in amended claim 34 of the present application.

Ashizawa and Asada further fail to teach or suggest a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display device that includes "forming a plurality of common electrodes connected to the common line, the common electrodes having at least one bent portion, and having an obtuse angle with the common line, wherein each of the plurality of common electrodes is formed to have a substantially sawtooth-shaped base in a region where each common electrode connects to the common line", as recited in amended independent claim 53 of the present application.

The Office Action concedes that Ashizawa fails to teach or suggest all the features recited in the claims of the present application. To remedy the deficient teachings of Ashizawa, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Asada. Based upon the teachings of Asada, the Office Action concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ashizawa by the teachings of Asada to obtain the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nothing in Asada teaches teaches the above recited features of independent claims 34 and 53 of the present application. Because Asada fails to teach these features of claims 34 and 53, Asada does not remedy the deficient teachings of Ashizawa such that a combination of Ashizawa and Asada, as suggested in the Office Action, would provide all the combined features recited in the claims of the present application.

Further, with regard to claim 39, the Office Action states that Ashizawa teaches the features recited in claim 39. Applicant respectfully submits that Ashizawa fails to teach a device “wherein one of the common electordes elongates in a direction along the data line and crosses the gate lines, wherein the elongated common electrode electrically communicates with adjacent pixel regions as recited in dependent claim 39 of the present application.

Based upon the above, neither Ashizawa nor Asada teaches the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Accordingly, claim 34 and its dependent claims 35-45 and 46-52, and independent claim 53 and its dependent claims 54-59 are allowable over any combination of Ashizawa and Asada. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashizawa and Asada, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,146, issued to Rho et al. (hereafter “Rho”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Ashizawa, Asada nor Rho, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features

recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Ashizawa, Asada and Rho fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device “wherein each of the plurality of common electrodes has a substantially sawtooth-shaped base in a region where each common electrode connects to the common line”, as recited in independent claim 34 of the present application, from which claim 45 depends.

Rho discloses “a thin film transistor liquid crystal display whose black matrix is formed on a thin film transistor substrate” (col. 1, lines 11-14). However, Rho fails to teach or suggest “each of the plurality of common electrodes has a substantially sawtooth-shaped base in a region where each common electrode connects to the common line”.

Because Rho fails to teach at least these features recited in independent claim 34, Applicant submits Rho fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Ashizawa and Asada. Accordingly, no combination of Ashizawa, Asada and Rho would provide a liquid crystal display device having the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. As such, claim 45, by virtue of its dependence from independent claim 34, is allowable over any combination of Ashizawa, Asada and Rho. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/695,908  
Response dated December 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated October 3, 2005

Docket No.: 8733.494.20-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: December 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant

Application No.: 10/695,908  
Response dated December 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated October 3, 2005

Docket No.: 8733.494.20-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: December 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant